Kept at M. K.

MICKEY MOUSE IN THE MOUNTAINS

The folks who brought you Disneyland yearn to turn California's Mineral King valley into a mammoth ski resort

by
Peter Browning

MINERAL KING VALLEY in the southern Sierra Nevada epitomizes the conflict involving conservationists, private industry, and government. Despite what seem to be similar ideas as to how nature should be treated, a bitter controversy has arisen over the future of the valley. Walt Disney Productions proposes to build a $35 million ski and tourist resort at Mineral King, an approach to conservation enthusiastically supported by the U.S. Forest Service, which administers the valley. The major opponent of the development is the Sierra Club, the nation's most prominent conservation group. The Club is certain that such a development would ruin the valley.

The controversy has been intensifying for almost seven years, replete with all the tactics and strategies that customarily attend such matters: claims, charges, counterclaims, objections, and a "class action" suit. The suit was filed in U.S. District Court by the Sierra Club, passed through a Federal Appeals Court, and is now on appeal to the Supreme Court. The Court heard oral arguments in the case last November and is expected to make a ruling early this year.

The ruling may well be a landmark. It could determine whether conservation groups and other citizens' organizations, even though not directly involved, are eligible to challenge the vast range of federal policies and actions affecting the environment. Laws protecting the environment are often inadequate or are not enforced. If judicial challenges to the decisions of federal agencies and officials are unsuccessful—or are not even permitted—then the conservationists will have nowhere to turn, and the great ado will have been meaningless.

Underlying the Mineral King controversy, and others like it, are the loud, angry, emotional differences over which should come first, environment or the economy. Those concerned on both sides of the issue use identical arguments to support their positions: We are doing this because we think it right and beneficial, because we think our actions will benefit our society and enhance the quality of life for all classes of people. But only in their statements of intent and professions of altruism do the two sides agree.

In truth, there is neither common cause, nor common ground, nor—if we hear correctly—even common understanding. Three organizations, all acting with benign intent, daily use the word "conservation" to describe radically different concepts. When the Forest Service uses the word it means utilizing the public land, in a variety of ways, to produce revenue. Disney Productions takes the word to describe a particular type of investment opportunity—building a resort and recreation center, on free land, in an area of great natural beauty. The Sierra Club uses the word to mean just leave well enough alone.

None of these is a pure attitude; all have evolved from simpler notions, from a time when questions were easy and answers obvious. For Disney it may seem like a giant step from the first simple animated cartoons to the construction of a huge tourist resort, but it is hardly a step at all. Rather it has been a natural linear progression: from cartoons to "live" films; thence to the imitation of life *cum* amusement park at Disneyland; from there to the imitation more real than reality, the new, self-contained Disney World in Florida, a Tomorrowland with a vengeance; and, thrown in for good measure, the planned resort at Mineral King. All of these activities are essentially the same: the packaging and marketing of mass entertainment, the manipulation of large numbers of people who have become adapted to passive pleasures and who expect the utmost in comfort. The Forest Service understands Disney's forte quite well: "Walt Disney Productions has established a mastery in the area of 'people management.'"

The Forest Service itself has evolved from the protector of the nation's forests from exploitation to become an apparent ally and protector of the exploiters. (Or, as in the case of Mineral King, the instigator of exploitation—the government agency that begs private developers to take over public land.) It is a familiar metamorphosis, one achieved by various federal regulatory agencies that have become the servants of those they are supposed to regulate.

The Sierra Club, too, has changed. In 1948 it viewed Mineral King as an area with high potential for ski development. In 1953 it was not opposed to making the area more accessible, and a policy favoring modest development still prevailed in the mid-Sixties. But by June 1969 the scope and crushing impact of the proposed Disney development had become apparent, and the Sierra Club modified its position. It filed the suit that has, thus far, prevented any development. And now, as the best way both to realize Mineral King's recreational potential and to protect its natural state, the Club proposes adding it to Sequoia National Park.

Peter Browning is a free-lance writer who spends his most pleasurable days in wilderness travel—by jeep in the desert, on foot in the mountains, and by canoe in the Far North.

2023.009.0214.a

HARPER'S MAGAZINE
MARCH 1972

Peter Browning

KEY MOUSE IN THE MOUNTAINS

Pristine state

MINERAL KING IS a rather small area to have generated such strong passions. The valley floor, at an altitude of 7,800 feet, is two miles long and a quarter-mile wide, an area of about 300 acres. The larger Mineral King basin, bordered on three sides by Sequoia National Park, comprises 15,000 acres (approximately twenty-four square miles). It is an oval-shaped basin, rimmed by eleven- and twelve-thousand-foot peaks, with half a dozen hanging valleys separated by narrow ridges. The basin is geologically young, with unstable, precipitous slopes still being formed by shifting stream beds, rock slides, and avalanches. There are about twenty-five summer cabins in the valley, but little else to show that it has been inhabited for more than one hundred years. Most of the terrain above the valley floor is in a pristine state, much as it was when the glaciers melted.

This fortunate state of affairs is not the result of the prescience and determination of any individual or organization. It is simply because the only access to Mineral King is via a narrow, steep, winding road—the last third of its twenty-five miles unpaved. Mineral King is only 228 miles from Los Angeles, 271 miles from San Francisco, and 55 miles from Visalia, the nearest large city in the Central Valley. That it has not long ago been overrun by people is due to a combination of topography and historical circumstance.

Mineral King was first visited by white men in the late 1850s. The valley was mistakenly thought to have rich mineral deposits, and during the Seventies and Eighties there was a modest, short-lived silver rush. When Sequoia National Park was created in 1890, Mineral King, which is topographically and ecologically a natural part of the park, was not included because of a few remaining mining interests—a condition considered incompatible with national park standards. Even though all mining ceased long ago, and the few buildings associated with the mining have disappeared, the anachronistic attitude still prevails. The 15,000 acres generally referred to as Mineral King became part of Sequoia National Forest, and in 1926 the area was designated as the Sequoia National Game Refuge.

In 1949 the Forest Service issued a prospectus inviting bids from private concerns to develop Mineral King as a winter sports resort. There was considerable interest, but no bids were made. The stickler was that inadequate county road. There were no state or federal funds available for a new road, and none of the interested private developers was willing to spend the millions of dollars needed to build a twenty-five-mile all-weather road in mountainous terrain.

Despite the inability of the Forest Service to find a bidder in 1949, the pressure was on and could only grow as affluence and leisure time increased. In February 1965 the Forest Service issued a new prospectus, outlining a development conservatively estimated to cost three million dollars—not including the expense of building a new access road. The road is the key to Mineral King; without it there can be no development.

The Forest Service received six bids that met the minimum qualifications. On July 16, 1965, while the Service was still considering the bids, the Mineral King road was suddenly added to the state highway system. No legislative hearings were held. Even more peculiar was the fact that no one seemed to be considering a critical aspect of the proposed new road: the only feasible route to Mineral King is roughly parallel to the existing road, which means crossing approximately nine miles of Sequoia National Park. But in 1916 Congress prohibited any use of the national parks that does not conform to the fundamental purpose of conserving natural and historic objects and the scenery. The proposed new road has but a single purpose: to connect a point on one side of the national park with a commercial enterprise on the other side. It is patently not meant to serve the park nor to do anything other than benefit a private concern.

In December 1965 the Forest Service accepted the proposal of Disney Productions for a $35 million development. Disney was issued a three-year development permit, authorizing the company to make surveys and plans.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall was strongly opposed to the Mineral King project, and at one time it seemed that his view would prevail. On December 2, 1967, an exchange of letters over Mineral King between Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman was made public. The two were in sharp disagreement. (The Forest Service is in the Department of Agriculture, and the Park Service is in Interior. The two services have a long history of rancorous dissension.) Udall wrote:

> *I am honestly worried by the thought that we will not be honored twenty-five years from now if we make a decision to violate this valley by a road.*

He also suggested establishing a special committee to study the matter. The idea was rejected by Freeman, who wrote:

> *This is out of the question. There have been long months of indecision and delay already. This administration, through my personal action, is committed to development of Mineral King.*

On December 27, Udall's resistance finally vanished. He said he had held out as long as possible by himself, but that now he would "reluctantly" approve the road.

2023.009.0214b

Mr. Udall, in a letter to this writer, said, "I was flatly opposed to the development and the road, and held up the project for nearly two years singlehandedly." He also said that Secretary Freeman "threatened to take the issue to the President and get him to overrule me. The Bureau of the Budget people at the highest level intervened and suggested that objections were, in effect, overruled by the Bureau of the Budget."

That was that. If the road could be built, then the primary obstacle in the way of development was removed.

Alpine "Americanized"

ON JANUARY 21, 1969, with neither public notice nor opportunity for review, the Forest Service accepted Disney's master plan for the development of Mineral King. But the thirty-year development permit was not issued, because one of the necessary conditions had not been met: the first contract for construction of the road had not been awarded. Before that occurred, the Sierra Club, on June 5, 1969, filed suit in U.S. District Court in San Francisco, seeking preliminary and permanent injunctions against the project.

One part of the Sierra Club suit was directed at the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture. Congress has set 80 acres as the maximum size for resorts developed under lease on national forest land. But the Forest Service, after granting Disney a thirty-year lease on 80 acres, also granted year-to-year leases on 300 acres more. This is land that would be permanently altered by the construction of the village and its associated facilities. Most of the remainder of the Sequoia National Game Refuge—some 13,000 acres—although not under lease to Disney, would be affected by construction of gondolas, chair lifts, and ski runs. The lawsuit charged that the lease arrangement "is a clear and patent effort to circumvent the 80-acre limitation." The suit also charged that the proposed use of the valley by Disney is a violation of its status as a national game refuge and that the Forest Service violated its own rules in failing to hold public hearings on whether Mineral King should be developed.

A second set of charges was directed at the Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior: that the proposed highway across a portion of Sequoia National Park does not serve a park purpose and is therefore prohibited by law; that the Park Service violated federal regulations that require a public hearing on both route and design of roads in national parks; and that Congress alone (and not the Secretary of the Interior) may authorize construction of a transmission line within a national park.

On July 23, 1969, District Court Judge William T. Sweigert issued a preliminary injunction that is still in effect. Judge Sweigert said he was not concerned with the controversy between so-called progressives and so-called conservationists; he thought the legal questions raised by the Sierra Club were sufficiently substantial and seri-

"The Forest Service understands Disney's forte quite well: Walt Disney Productions has established a mastery in the area of 'people management.' "

Allen J. Malmquist

Mineral King valley: a small area for such strong passions

2023.009.0214

ous to deserve being tried on their merits. Even more important, Judge Sweigert rejected the government's contention that the Sierra Club had no right to sue on behalf of the public because it did not have any "private, substantive, legally protected interest" in Mineral King.

The government appealed. On September 17, 1970, a Federal appeals court, by a 2-to-1 vote, overturned the injunction, ruling that the Sierra Club had no legal standing by which to contest actions of the federal officials who approved the Mineral King development. The decision came as a great shock to conservationists, inasmuch as the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in New York had declared such a right in the Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference's suit opposing the Storm King power project in New York, and again in a suit against the proposed Hudson Expressway. The appeals judges also ruled, unanimously, that the Sierra Club's argument against the project was so weak that Judge Sweigert had erred by issuing the injunction.

In its appeal to the Supreme Court, the Sierra Club noted that "the issue here is not a choice between the Sierra Club and a more appropriate plaintiff but between the Sierra Club and nobody." The government argument, in effect, is that *no one* may object to the Mineral King development because no one is economically affected and therefore no one has legal standing.

THE FOREST SERVICE PROSPECTUS of 1965 called for a development costing $3 million. The facilities were to include lifts or tramways with a capacity of 2,000 people per hour; parking for 1,700 automobiles; overnight accommodations for 100 people; plus the necessary supply, sanitation, and maintenance structures. Four years later the Forest Service approved a development costing ten times as much—one that would crowd as many as 14,000 people at a time into a very small valley. (The original Disney proposal estimated there would be two and a half million visitors annually. Later the figure was reduced to 1.7 million. The current estimate is 980,000. The reasons for these reductions are obscure. One apparently is that the Forest Service plans to eliminate all camping in the valley. Another may be that they are intended to quell the objections of conservationists.)

The scope of the development is overwhelming. Disney plans an "American Alpine" village. At the end of the new road there will be an eight- to ten-story parking structure for 3,600 vehicles. Nearby will be food storage and preparation areas, and accommodations for nearly 1,000 employees. There will also be a hospital, heliport, wardrobe department, administration offices, and a service station. From this point visitors will travel two and a half miles on "colorful excursion trains" to the village proper, which will have restaurants, boutiques, a 1,030-room hotel complex providing lodging for 3,310 people, a convention center, a theater, an equestrian center, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, and an ice-skating rink. And there are going to be twenty-two to twenty-seven ski lifts.

The late Walt Disney said: "Mineral King's great natural beauty must be preserved at all costs." Disney Productions' proposal states:

> *Grooming and manicuring of most slopes without destroying the naturalness of the area particularly for intermediates, will require extensive bulldozing and blasting in most lower areas and extensive rock removal at higher elevations.*

What a strange "naturalness."

There was once a small general store at Mineral King, but it's gone now. There is no café; you bring your food with you. But the collection of restaurants Disney plans to build is stunning. In the first year of operation there will be nine food-service facilities seating 1,300 people. They are designed to cater to all tastes and degrees of affluence: snack bars and coffee shops, "buffeterias," a "teen center," and a "gourmet restaurant" atop a village hotel. By the fifth year, there will be thirteen facilities seating 2,350 people. Among these will be a 150-seat sandwich shop at the Midway Gondola Terminal on Miner's Ridge at an altitude of 9,200 feet—1,400 feet above the valley floor. At the end of the gondola line, a place called Eagle's Crest, will be a 150-seat coffee shop located in the "enclosed lift terminal." This is only a few yards from the national park boundary, at an elevation of 11,090 feet.

Can anyone still remember that this is a national game refuge? The Forest Service has largely ignored the possibility of damage to the natural flora and fauna, or has assumed that conflict between humans and animals will be resolved when the animals leave the area because their habitat has been destroyed. The Forest Service has never conducted a biological survey of the area: no studies of the deer or their need for a summer range, even though the valley floor has the best forage in the entire game refuge; no studies of the impact on plant life, not even of the effects of heavy foot and horse traffic.

This is not because the Forest Service is a blundering, inefficient bureaucracy, or because decisions have been made by stupid or venal men. The assumptions of the Service guarantee that decisions favorable to development will be made. If you assume that development is in the public interest, and that the bigger the development the better, then the only studies you make will be concerned with *how* to develop. The logical prior question of *whether* to develop will never even be raised.

There have been some doubts and opposition even within the Service. A memorandum from

2023.009.0214 d

the Range and Wildlife Management Section in 1967 states:

> *The total basic concept of development appears badly biased in orientation toward a highly artificial, continued situation, without any real attention to ecological factors. . . . Specifically, stream diversions and channel treatment, flood and debris control, surface water supply development, and sewage disposal proposals are all of a nature we find severely damaging or unacceptable. It is recognized that development of high intensity year-round recreational use in this restricted sub-alpine area is bound to result in pronounced impacts and certain unavoidable changes.*

Yet in a publicity release, "Background Material: Basis for Master Plan Approval," the Forest Service says that "none of the development planned for Mineral King shall have adverse effect on native animal life now in the valley." Later the release observes that "lifts, trails, and conducted tours will make a wide variety of plants available for study in their natural situations." But how can that be? The "natural situations" will no longer exist. On the very next page one reads:

> *Areas of concentrated human use will need to be developed to resist human abrasion and erosion, as well as to provide for visitor comfort and safety. Heavily used trails, paths, and concentration areas will need to be specially developed to protect the associated natural values.*

What those sentences appear to say, while trying to seem as though they're not saying it, is that so many people will be brought into the valley that the vegetation will be trampled to death, and that to protect the vegetation the ground will have to be paved.

Ten tons of trash

THE BEST-KNOWN GUIDEBOOK to the Sierra Nevada, one that was published in 1934 and is frequently updated, is *Starr's Guide to the John Muir Trail and the High Sierra.* In the introduction to his guidebook Starr wrote:

> *Because of the vastness and roughness of this high mountain region, I do not believe there is any danger of having it overrun and spoiled.*

That was written less than forty years ago; as prophecy it could not have been more wrong. Today in the High Sierra there are many places where, in July and August, you meet people at every bend in the trail. The more popular trails have been ground to powder by horses and mules. A ranger at Tuolumne Meadows in Yosemite National Park told me a few years ago that, on an average August day, there were 4,000 people

John Rettenmayer

Bruce Barnbaum

"In a world turned strangely upside-down, it has come to seem that nature itself is not natural, that it is an inadequate order of things."

2023.009.0214 a

Peter Browning

MICKEY MOUSE IN THE MOUNTAINS

on the 190 miles of the Muir Trail between there and Mt. Whitney—and it grows worse every year. Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks put out a two-page sheet listing fifty-seven lakes, basins, meadows, creeks, and valleys that have become "problem areas" because of overuse by campers and stock parties.

Mineral King is represented—by all concerned but for differing reasons—as being remote and little frequented. But there *is* a road, no matter that it is narrow and winding, that is traveled by several thousand cars during the five months of the year it is free of snow. Twenty-four thousand people visited Mineral King in 1968. The Park Service sheet says of lakes within ten miles of the valley that they "receive heavy backpacker use from Mineral King." If the number of people reaching Mineral King increases fortyfold, the number getting into the back country might increase by an even greater factor. At Mineral King the situation would be aggravated by the existence of chair lifts, some of which would go all the way to the ridge at the boundary of the national park. There are literally thousands of people who wouldn't think of hiking five or six strenuous miles entailing an altitude gain of 3,000 feet, but who would gladly pay several dollars to ride a chair lift or gondola.

In the mountains, as everywhere else in the United States, trash removal and litter are problems. In 1965, in the area of Big Five Lakes (in Sequoia National Park, about five miles northeast of Mineral King), the Park Service collected ten tons of trash—this at an altitude of 10,000 feet. Already in August 1970 it looked as if the Park Service could have gathered another ten tons. The problem will become insuperable if the area can be reached by an easy hike after riding a chair lift to the ridge. Radically increasing the number of people entering Mineral King will destroy, beyond repair or redemption, the natural environment not only of the valley itself but also of the adjacent portions of the national park.

In Yosemite valley, 150 miles north of Mineral King, the Park Service is making a valiant effort to correct past errors. Yosemite has been plagued by smog, crime, noise pollution, and trouble with sewage disposal. The number of campsites has been reduced by half, and there will be no further increase in overnight accommodations.

Mineral King presents much the same situation as Yosemite valley, except that Yosemite is several times as large. Yet the peak daily use projected for Mineral King would produce three times the concentration of people found at Yosemite on busy days—concentrations that have nearly overwhelmed Yosemite in recent years. The Forest Service and Disney Productions seem not to have heard of the problems encountered elsewhere. Because of the economics involved, they wish to have a population density exceeding that of most urban centers. Indeed, they want to create a small vacation city, complete with all the shops, entertainments, and facilities needed to attract a clientele with time on its hands and money to spend. If Disney Productions were obliged to rely on revenues from skiing alone, it would probably find the game not worth the candle.

Disney estimates that 60 per cent of the visitors to Mineral King will come in the summer. Many of them will make the trip simply because it is there to be made; it will be a nice one-day jaunt. But many would *not* make the drive if there were nothing at the end of the road—such as an excursion train, cafeterias, shops, and an audio-visual presentation to provide entertainment. It's like the story about a tourist who, after gazing at the Grand Canyon for thirty seconds, says, "It's great, but what do you *do* here?" The Disney development itself would be the major attraction at Mineral King. For all that some visitors might care about the surroundings, it could just as well be located in the Mojave Desert or Los Angeles.

American mores—or perhaps American mythology—demand that land be used, that undeveloped land is wasted; that, all men being equal, all are entitled to use the public land; and that all *types* of use are equally valid. If Disney were to build a thirty-lane bowling alley in the center of Mineral King valley, the lanes would soon be in constant use. Disney could then counter all objections by pointing out that, obviously, bowling was what people wanted and their needs had been met. That may sound farfetched, but it is the sort of specious argument used to justify grandiose development at Mineral King. Southern Californians don't have enough nearby areas for skiing: therefore they "demand" more ski resorts, as though the deficiencies of the Southern California climate must be overcome by gigantic engineering and construction projects, done at exorbitant cost and great damage to the landscape. It is the sort of demand that increases without end.

Indeed, the Disney project is open-ended. The Forest Service, in its prospectus, established *minimum* requirements for the development of Mineral King, but there are no upper limits on what may be done. The Service says it will consider the merits of each request for increased facilities. But if the existing facilities are overtaxed, Disney will simply be able to claim that the public "demands" further development. Since there is no stated limit, if Disney insists more facilities are needed to serve the public and turn a profit, the Forest Service will be unable to deny the requests. Walt Disney himself said that "our efforts now and in the future will be dedicated to making Mineral King grow to meet the ever-increasing public need. I guess you might say that it won't ever be finished."

2023.009.0214 F

Home truths

THE FATE OF MINERAL KING is still unknown. But even should the courts eventually decide in favor of the Sierra Club, there is a larger issue that must be resolved: have we not reached the point, in certain places in the United States, where we must desist from *any* further development? Has not the ethic of "progress" through engineering and construction been thoroughly discredited? Can we expect to gain anything from another resort complex in the Sierra Nevada that is remotely comparable to what we shall lose?

There is a reality to the Sierra Nevada, hard facts and home truths that must be recognized and dealt with. It is finite; it is irreplaceable; it is under tremendous pressure from a large, recreation-oriented population; and, despite its seeming strength and ruggedness, it is being overused and severely damaged. Even if no more access roads are built into the Sierra, no more ski resorts constructed, it may soon become necessary to limit the number of people admitted to the mountains at one time. Last summer the Forest Service began requiring permits for all those who enter California Wilderness Areas. A permit can be had for the asking—no one will be turned down. But it is a harbinger of things to come. Rationing of the wilderness is in the offing; it seems there is no way to avoid it.

The National Environmental Policy Act, which became law on January 1, 1970, states that its first goal is to "fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustees of the environment for succeeding generations." In order to do that, we need to have a better idea than we now have of what those responsibilities are, so that we may be loyal to that idea and thus serve future generations.

Basic conservation consists merely in not doing anything overt: don't build roads, don't chop down trees, don't erect dams. The most harmful fallacy is that we can have our cake and eat it too—that we can retain the wilderness and at the same time develop it. How is it possible to have a "wilderness experience" when the wilderness has been effectively abolished? At Mineral King, even the distant view will no longer be of a natural scene; the slopes will be scarred by ski runs, chair lifts, and steel towers.

It was once the common wisdom in this country—and is still the common assumption—that we have space and time enough to satisfy all our desires. But the space is disappearing, and time runs away. If we are to salvage even a modicum of the beauty that was, then we must commit no more acts of desecration against nature. There is not even the time or space remaining to make experiments: to try controlled admissions or to settle for a lesser complex in Mineral King, as though disposition of the remaining wilderness were a matter of democratic compromise. There is evidence enough at hand to make us want to stop—forever—further destruction of the Sierra Nevada.

For most Americans, roads, automobiles, and all their attendant paraphernalia are natural; it is difficult to believe they have not always existed. They constitute a familiar, secure environment. And in a world strangely turned upside down, it has come to seem to most people that nature itself is not natural, that it is an inadequate order of things, a botched job—and it needs to be fixed, to be "developed" so as to conform to what is familiar to urban people.

Stewart Udall was right: if Mineral King is violated by a road, we—all of us—undoubtedly will not be honored twenty-five years from now. But fifty years from now—and beyond—it might not strike the Americans of that time in the same way. If the history of the twentieth century has taught us anything, it is that men seem to be infinitely adaptable, eternally capable of accepting the prevailing circumstances as natural. If all one has ever known about Mineral King is that a huge resort covers the valley, well then, isn't that just the way it is? Twenty-five years from now there will still be many people who remember Mineral King as it once was, before development. Those who care will lament an irretrievable loss, but lamentation will be all that is left to them. As for the others, they will neither know nor care.

The defenders of Mineral King may prophesy a "breaking point" or "point of no return," a point beyond which a certain mountain valley was lost forever to the developers. If they are right, if it comes, it will be as bad as they foresaw—but it will not be the end of the world. It will be absorbed, and become part of the new reality. Yesterday's predicted horror is tomorrow's bland normality.

In T. S. Eliot's *The Cocktail Party*, Reilly says:

> *Half of the harm that is done in this world*
> *Is due to people who want to feel important.*
> *They don't mean to do harm—but the harm*
> *does not interest them.*
> *Or they do not see it, or they justify it*
> *Because they are absorbed in the endless*
> *struggle*
> *To think well of themselves.*

Perhaps nothing can save Mineral King but a miracle: a radical change of heart by the American people. We need to be able to forgo the economic benefits, the all-weather road, the big hotel, the fancy shops, the swank eateries. Just leave well enough alone. The way to preserve Mineral King is to preserve it—*not* develop it. If we do that we will have good reason—and so will the succeeding generations—to feel important and think well of ourselves. □

2023.009.0214 3